



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,028	07/24/2001	Kazuyuki Nakata	AD-6705	5970

7590 08/05/2003

Craig A Evans  
E I du Pont de Nemours & Company  
Legal Patents  
Wilmington, DE 19898

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1714

12

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/890,028	NAKATA, KAZUYUKI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Patrick D. Niland	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.                  6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1714

1. The amendment of 6/25/03 has been entered. Claims 1-12 are pending.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2269822

Best in view of US Pat. No.5319019 Nothnagel.

Best discloses the instantly claimed dispersion except does not disclose the instantly claimed excess of ammonia nor the instantly claimed melt flow rate. See the entire document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed melt flow rate because the polymer of Best would probably need to be within the instantly claimed broad melt flow rate range in order to form a film from a dispersion and to give the small particle size disclosed by Best. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the instantly claimed excess of ammonia because Nothnagel shows such excess ammonia to give more stable polyacrylate dispersions for the reasons stated at column 10, line 62 to column 11, line 7 and this stability would have been expected in the dispersion of Best for reasons which the ordinary skilled artisan would understand based on the teachings of Nothnagel, particularly the fact that ammonia is volatile and its removal will lead to polymer which does not have enough salt groups to keep it stably dispersed. This is well understood in the art today. The applicant's arguments with regard to the

Art Unit: 1714

comparative examples of Best are noted. However, Best is cited not for its comparative examples but for its other teachings. Best is acknowledged to not teach the instantly claimed excess of ammonia. Nothnagel is cited for this teaching. The argument that Nothnagel does not disclose ethylene/acrylic copolymers is not seen as material. The ordinary skilled artisan understands the relationship of HLB (hydrophile/lipophile balance) to giving a dispersible polymer. This relationship holds regardless of the identity of the specific comonomers. It is noted that many of the monomers of Nothnagel are more hydrophobic than ethylene since they have such large quantities of hydrocarbon. The ordinary skilled artisan would thus understand that the above arguments related to Nothnagel also apply to ethylene acrylic copolymers. No evidence to the contrary is seen. The alternative phraseology "or" of the primary reference would clearly imply that where ammonium hydroxide, i.e. aqueous ammonia, is used the alkali metal compounds are not. The newly added amendment limitations are not seen as overcoming this rejection as the newly added limitations are met by the references cited, as stated above.

4. This is a Request for Continued Examination of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/890028. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1714

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Niland whose telephone number is (703) 308-3510. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan, can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

pn

August 3, 2003



Patrick Niland  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1714

Application/Control Number: 09/890028

Page 5

Art Unit: 1714